



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,505	10/31/2000	Yishay Mor	50325-0500	2958

29989 7590 08/09/2005

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/703,505

Applicant(s)

MOR, YISHAY

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9-16, 18-23, 26, 29, 32 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9-16, 18-23, 26, 29, 32 and 33 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- 1) This Final Rejection is in response to the amendments/reply filed on 4/25/05.
- 2) Examiner maintains the 35 USC 103 rejection and introduces a NonPatent Literature article (Martin, please see details below) to address the amendments.
- 3) Examiner uses 10/31/2000 as the effective filing date for this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4-1) Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 29, 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison et al (US6611725, filed 9/25/00) in view of Non Patent Article, "SVG Basic Example", Ken Sall (9/6/99, see IDS)(hereinafter "Sall"), further in view of Non Patent Article, "Integration by Parts: XSLT, Xlink and SVG", Didier Martin (3/22/2000)(hereinafter "Martin").

Claim 1, Harrison teaches

A method of providing information about an object through a graphical interface, the method comprising:

binding to the SVG statements a pointer to a resource, wherein the resource includes

information pertaining to the object (ie., linking the supplementary data to one of the model components based on tag data associating the selected image)(col 2, lines 55-65),

Harrison does not expressly teach, but Sall teaches

creating and storing scalable vector graphics (SVG) statements in a document, the SVG statements associated with a graphical representation of the object (ie., screenshot shows svg statement in an editor associated with an image)(page 1).

Harrison in view of Sall does not expressly teach the amended claim limitations, but Martin teaches the amended claim limitations (ie., Integration by parts of XML and SVG for distinguishing parts that contain other parts from the contained parts, using a container of locators for a collection of elements containing other parts (see page 2 of Martin article).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harrison to include svg statement in an editor associating with an image as taught by Sall, providing the benefit of and example of displaying images with svg (Sall, page 1, 1st line) and providing 2D projected views on scalable vector graphics file format (Harrison, col 2, lines 16-27), further to include integration of parts of XML and SVG for distinguishing parts that contain other parts from the contained parts as taught by Martin, providing the benefit of facilitating the manipulation, linking and searching of graphical content to publish and manage content and exchange of content between fools during authoring process for a more dynamic web experience for end-user, which

was well known in the art at the time of the invention (for evidentiary support, see W3C Releases First Working Draft of Scalable Vector Graphics Specification, 1999, page 2).

Claim 3, Harrison teaches

The method of claim 1, wherein the resource is a second document and the pointer includes a location of an element in the second document (ie., components referenced by the tag data ... in separately stored documents)(col 2, lines 50-51).

Claim 6, Harrison teaches

*The method of claim 1, further comprising:
creating and storing additional SVG statements in the document, the additional statements associated with an other graphical representation of another object (ie., user annotating/changing a drawing of a particular structure where drawing file is maintained and updated)(col 3, line 64 – col 4, line 10); and
binding the additional SVG statements to another pointer to the resource, wherein the resource includes additional information pertaining to the other object (ie., linking the supplementary data to one of the model components based on tag data associating the selected image)(col 2, lines 55-65).*

Claim 7, Harrison teaches

*the steps of
extracting the pointer to the resource from a binding element in the document, the binding element associated with the SVG statements,
determining whether a user has selected the graphical representation of the object,
and if the user has selected the graphical representation, then using information in the*

resource based on the pointer (ie., using the displayed pointer by a mouse device, user selects image which is then retrieved, which is equivalent to extrating)(col 7, lines 40-57);

Harrison does not expressly teach, but Sall teaches

presenting a graphical representation of the object based on the scalable vector graphics (SVG) statements in a-the document (ie., screenshot shows svg statement in an editor associated with an image)(page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harrison to include svg statement in an editor associating with an image as taught by Sall, providing the benefit of and example of displaying images with svg (Sall, page 1, 1st line) and providing 2D projected views on scalable vector graphics file format (Harrison, col 2, lines 16-27).

Claim 10, Harrison teaches

the method further comprises providing statements in at least one of a scripting language and a programming language, the statements mapping an area on a display associated with the graphical representation to a link including the pointer to the resource (ie., object –oriented programming language on the document)(col 9, line 50) ; and

said determining whether a user has selected the graphical representation comprises determining whether a pointing device has placed a cursor over the area (ie., using the displayed pointer by a mouse pointer device, user selects image which is then retrieved, where the user must place the mouser pointer over the selection region).

Claim 11, Harrison teaches

The method of claim 7, said using the information in the resource comprising displaying the information to the user (ie., 2D projected views on computer display screen using svg along with image elements)(col 2, lines 16-40).

Claim 12, Harrison teaches

The method of claim 7, said using the information in the resource comprising launching a separate application to operate on the resource based on the pointer (ie., upon selecting an element, the user activates a procedure allowing supplementary data to be input)(col 7, lines 45-55).

Claim 14. Harrison teaches *method the method comprising:*

retrieving e-the document wherein the scalable vector graphics (SVG) statements are associated with a first graphical representation of the object (ie., accessing and editing documents for model documents)(col 2, summary section); extracting a-the pointer to a-the resource from a binding element in the document, the binding element associated with the SVG statements (ie., using the displayed pointer by a mouse device, user selects image which is then retrieved, which is equivalent to extrating)(col 7, lines 40-57); retrieving information from the resource based on the pointer (ie., user input selecting)(col 2, line 54); modifying the SVG statements based on the information (ie., editing data including image elements)(col 4, lines 62-66); and presenting a second graphical representation of the object based on the SVG

statements after said modifying (ie., once the editing/modifying of a drawing is complete, then the files are processed to generate the drawing documents)(col 4, line 62 – col 5, line 11).

Claim 15. Harrison teaches

The method of claim 14, wherein:

the second graphical representation indicates the current status of the object (ie., as parametric data associated with object is displayed for a model, that is the current detail of the components)(col 7, lines 59-67).

Claim 18. Harrison teaches

The method of claim 14, said modifying the SVG statementscomprising:

inserting an anchor for a hyperlink to another resource (ie., hyperlink)(col 7, line 25);

and

inserting the second graphical representation of the object into the anchor (ie., after generation of document ... supplementary data added to the drawing file).

Claim 19. Harrison teaches

The method of claim 18, said modifying the SVG statements further comprising including in the hyperlink at least a portion of the information retrieved from the resource based on the pointer (ie., inserting parameter data as hyperlink associated with image data)(col 7, lines 20-30).

Claim 20. Harrison teaches

The method of claim 18, wherein the second graphical representation

is the same as the first graphical representation (ie., after the supplementary data is added to the drawing document and is rendered to terminal which is equivalent as 1st document that is rendered)(col 7, lines 35-45).

Claim 21. Harrison teaches

The method of claim 18, said modifying the SVG statements further comprising removing the binding element from the SVG statements (ie., transferring ... deleting components from the drawing)(col 8, lines 61-67).

Claim 22. Harrison teaches

The method of claim 18, said modifying the SVG statements further comprising removing the SVG statements that form the first graphical representation of the object (ie., transferring ... deleting from the original drawing document)(col 8, lines 61-67).

Claim 23. Harrison teaches

A computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions, wherein execution of the one or more sequences of instructions by one the one or more processors causes the one or more processors to perform the steps recited in anv of Claims Is 2. 3. 4, 5 6. 7. 8. 9.10. 1 1% 12. 13. 14% 15. 16. 17. 18. 29. 20. 21. or 22 (ie., CPU ... command to a computer-aided design software)(col 5, lines 13-25).*

Claim 26. Harrison teaches

*A computer apparatus comprising:
one or more processors; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the one or more processors, the computer-readable medium containing one or more sequences of*

Art Unit: 2176

instructions, wherein execution of the one or more sequences of instructions by the one or more processors causes the one or more processors to perform the steps recited in any of Claims 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12s 13, 14. 15. 16. 17. 18% 29. 20.

21, or 22 (ie., CPU ... command to a computer-aided design software)(col 5, lines 13-25).

Claim 29, Harrison teaches

An apparatus for providing information about an object through a graphical interface, the apparatus comprising means for performing the functions recited in the steps of any of perform the steps recited in any of Claims 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10s 11. 12. 13. 14s 15a 16, 17. 18a 29. 20. 21 (ie., CPU ... command to a computer-aided design software)(col 5, lines 13-25).

Claim 32, 33, Harrison in view of Sall does not expressly teach, but Martin teaches

Extracting a value ... through a pointer (ie., a part contained in another part inherits from the xlink:locator features and then becomes an element contained in a collection where each element contained in the collection points to a portion of the illustration (in the SVG document)(see Martin, page 2, 4th paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harrison in view of Sall to include an element contained in the collection that points to a portion of the illustration as taught by Martin, providing the benefit of facilitating the manipulation, linking and searching of graphical content to publish and manage content and exchange of content between users during authoring process for a more dynamic web experience for end-user, which was well known in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2176

of the invention (for evidentiary support, see W3C Releases First Working Draft of Scalable Vector Graphics Specification, 1999, page 2).

4-2) Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison et al (as cited above) in view of Sall (as cited above) and Martin (as cited above), further in view of Lewallen (US 6675230, filed Aug 22, 2000).

Claim 2, Harrison in view of Sall and Martin does not expressly teach, but Lewallen teaches

The method of claim 1, wherein the resource is a database and the pointer includes a query for a data item in the database (ie., queries to access data from a database)(col 9, lines 9-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harrison in view of Sall and Martin to include queries to access data from a database as taught by Lewallen, providing the benefit of an improved platform to allow Java applications to access operating system components and objects outside of the area of execution of the Java program used on a graphical user interface (Lewallen, col 3, lines 12-20) with Scalable Vector Graphics (col 8, line 60).

4-3) Claim 5, 13, 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison et al (as cited above) in view of Sall (as cited above) and Martin (as cited above), further in view of Lewallen (as cited above), further in view of Chithambaram et al (US 6674445, filed Jul 31, 2000).

Claim 5, 13, 16, Harrison in view of Sall and Martin does not expressly teach, but Lewallen teaches

The method of claim 1, wherein:

the object is one of a network device and a link between network devices (ie., computers via a network)(col 16, lines 15-25);

Harrison in view of Sall and Lewallen does not teach, but Chithambaram teaches *the resource is a database of at least one of network devices and network connections associated with a managed network; and the pointer indicates a database element associated with the object* (ie., user of GIS can perform complex queries on client PDA from browser to a server/network which has the information requested by user)(col 2, lines 5-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harrison in view of Sall and Martin to include computers on a network as taught by Lewallen, providing the benefit of an improved platform to allow Java applications to access operating system components and objects outside of the area of execution of the Java program used on a graphical user interface (Lewallen, col 3, lines 12-20) with Scalable Vector Graphics (col 8, line 60), further to include a GIS where user can perform complex queries on a client PDA from browser to a server which has the information requested by the user as taught by Chithambaram, providing the benefit of a schema for storage of geographical information on a PDS for complex queries (Chithambaram, Abstract section) augmented with compacted vector data (col 4, line 17-19).

4-4) Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison et al (as cited above) in view of Sall (as cited above) and Martin (as cited above), further in view of Sorge et al (US 6565609, filed Jun 1999).

Claim 9. Harrison teaches

said determining whether a user has selected the graphical representation comprises determining whether a pointing device has placed a cursor over the area (ie., using the displayed pointer by a mouse pointer device, user selects image which is then retrieved, where the user must place the mouser pointer over the selection region); and
Harrison in view of Sall and Martin does not expressly teach, but Sorge teaches *the method further comprises defining a style sheet which maps an area on a display associated with the graphical representation to a link including the pointer to the resource (ie., stylesheet applied to HTML documents ... simultaneously with SVG elements)(col 1, lines 25-60)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harrison in view of Sall and Martin to include applying style sheet to HTML document with SVG elements as taught by Sorge, providing the benefit of translating data into html while retaining formatting and functionality for returning the translated data to a parent application (Sorge, title).

Response to Arguments

5) Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-16, 18-23, 26, 29, 32, 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues (on page 9) that Sall does not teach DTD with SVG, however, this was

Art Unit: 2176

well known in the art at the time of the invention (as evidenced by W3C documentation) and when viewed in conjunction with the Martin article's teaching of pointers in SVG document to external elements, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Applicant argue (on page 10) for claims 7 and 14, about the extracting a pointer to information. For addressing this, the Martin article teaches a collection of pointers to a portion of the illustration. Applicant argues for claim 12, that Harrison does not teach launching a separate application. For addressing this, the Martin article teaches an Adobe SVG viewer as a browser plug-in embedded in the HTML document. With the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner interprets the Adobe as equivalent to the a separate application that is launched.

Overall, although the SVG technology was new and still a frontier for development at the time of the invention, it was well known in the art with non SVG technology to do what the claimed invention does (as stated in the Applicant background section) and performing these functions with SVG technology was the objective set by the W3C to solve with the development of SVG.

Conclusion

6) Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2176

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G.S

GS


WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/4/2005